

## REMARKS

The claims are claims 1 to 11.

Claims 1, 5 and 7 are amended. Claims 8 to 11 are added. Claim 1 is amended to explicitly recite that the second bus devices are different from the first bus devices and that the second bus is different from the first bus. Claim 5 has been amended to include the originally omitted end period. Claim 7 has been amended into independent form incorporating the limitations of its base claim 1. Claims 8 to 11 recite subject matter of the scope of respective claims 3 to 6 except dependent upon amended claim 7.

Claims 1, 2 and 4 to 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Smith U.S. Patent No. 6,629,178.

Claim 1 recites subject matter not anticipated by Smith. Claim 1 recites "a first data bus connected to each of said plurality of first bus devices" and "a second data bus different from said first data bus connected to each of said plurality of second bus devices." Claim 1 also recites Smith fails to teach two busses each coupled to plural devices. The OFFICE ACTION cites bus agent 250N as anticipating the first bus devices and bus agent 250H as anticipating the second bus devices. Smith states at column 4, lines 50 and 51:

"Bus interface unit 251-A is coupled to a plurality of bus agents 250 by bus 214."

Figure 2 of Smith clearly illustrates a single bus 214 coupled to both bus agent 250N and bus agent 250H. Thus bus agent 250N and 250H cannot be the first and second bus devices as stated in the OFFICE ACTION because they are connected to the same bus 214 and not different busses as recited in claim 1. The OFFICE ACTION cites column 5, lines 35 to 47 as anticipating the first data bus. This portion of Smith fails to mention any data busses. This

portion of Smith concerns arbitration among normal-priority bus agents 250N. The OFFICE ACTION cites column 5, lines 52 to 61 as anticipating the second data bus. This portion of Smith mentions only a single bus, bus 214. Figure 2 clearly illustrates that bus agent 250H and all bus agents 250N are connected to bus 214.

Figure 1 of Smith also fails to anticipate the recited first and second bus devices and first and second busses of claim 1. Figure 1 of Smith illustrates plural busses but only PCI bus 214 includes plural bus devices as recited in claim 1. Memory bus 206 is illustrated as connected to bus bridge 202 and main memory 204. AGP bus 210 is illustrated as connected to bus bridge 202 and graphics controller 208. PCI bus 214 is illustrated as connected to bus bridge 202, PCI device 212A, PCI device 212B and secondary bus bridge 216. ISA/EISA bus 220 is illustrated as connected to secondary bus bridge 216 and ISA device 218. CPU bus 224 is illustrated as connected to processor 10 and bus bridge 212. Note that claim 1 recites a bus bridge that is connected to both the first bus and the second bus. Accordingly, Smith fails to anticipate claim 1.

Claim 2 recites subject matter not anticipated by Smith. Claim 2 recites "said at least one first bus master device consists of a central processing unit." Smith fails to teach this central processing unit. Processor 10 illustrated in Figure 1 of Smith cannot be this central processing unit because it is not one of a plurality of first bus devices connected to a first bus as recited in base claim 1. The OFFICE ACTION cites 224 illustrated in Figure 1 of Smith as anticipating this limitation. However, Figure 1 of Smith clearly shows element 224 is a CPU bus. Smith designates this element 224 as a CPU bus at column 3, lines 33 and line 52, column 4, lines 39 and 60 and column 5, lines 19 to 20. Accordingly, this structure is not the central processing unit recited in claim 2. This claim 2 is not anticipated by Smith.

Claims 3 to 6 are allowable by dependence upon allowable claim 1.


Paragraph 7 of the OFFICE ACTION stated that claim 7 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of its base claims. Claim 7 has been so amended and is therefore allowable.

Claims 8 to 11 are allowable by dependence upon allowable claim 7.

The Applicants respectfully submit that all the present claims are allowable for the reasons set forth above. Therefore early reconsideration and advance to issue are respectfully requested.

If the Examiner has any questions or other correspondence regarding this application, Applicants request that the Examiner contact Applicants' attorney at the below listed telephone number and address to facilitate prosecution.

Texas Instruments Incorporated  
P.O. Box 655474 M/S 3999  
Dallas, Texas 75265  
(972) 917-5290  
Fax: (972) 917-4418

Respectfully submitted,  
  
Robert D. Marshall, Jr.  
Reg. No. 28,527